UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT District of Maine

ERIC ERICSON,	
Petitioner)
v.	No. 2:14-cv-315-GZS
SCOTT LANDRY, WARDEN,))
MAINE CORRECTIONAL CENTER,	
Respondent.))

ORDER AFFIRMING THE RECOMMENDED DECISION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

The United States Magistrate Judge filed with the Court on December 31, 2014, his Recommended Decision (ECF No. 17). Petitioner filed four Motions to extend Time to Respond to Recommended Decision (ECF Nos. 20, 22, 24 & 26), all of which were granted. Petitioner filed a Fifth Motion to Extend to Respond to Recommended Decision (ECF No. 28) which was denied and is to be treated as Petitioner's Objection to the Recommended Decision. In addition, the Magistrate Judge gave the Petitioner the opportunity to supplement his objection to the Recommended Decision on or before April 24, 2015. Petitioner filed an Objection to the Order denying his Fifth Motion to Extend (ECF No. 31) on April 27, 2015.

I have reviewed and considered the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision, together with the entire record; I have made a <u>de novo</u> determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision; and I concur with the recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his Recommended Decision, and determine that no further proceeding is necessary.

- 1. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **AFFIRMED**.
- 2. It is **ORDERED** that a request for an evidentiary hearing is **DENIED** as it is not warranted under Rule 8 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 cases.
- 3. It is **ORDERED** that Petitioner's 28 U.S.C. §2254 Petition (ECF No. 1) is **DISMISSED**.
- 4. It is **ORDERED** that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED** because there is no substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. 2253(c)(2).

/s/George Z. Singal U.S. District Judge

Dated this 13th day of May, 2015